



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,354	04/27/2001	Tomoko Terakado	450100-4138.1	3992
20999	7590	05/18/2006	EXAMINER	
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG			BROWN, RUEBEN M	
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.				
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/844,354	TERAKADO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Reuben M. Brown	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant's statement that both the present application and Yoshinobu (US 5,686,954) were, at the time the present invention was made, subject to an obligation of assignment to the same organization, i.e., Sony Corporation overcomes the previous rejection. Thus in light of applicant's statement, the previous rejection, mailed 12/29/05, has been withdrawn. A new rejection on the merits follows.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 12 recites, "a computer program product", with reciting "stored or embodied on a computer readable medium". Data structures not claimed as embodied in a computer readable medium are descriptive per se and are not statutory because they are not capable of causing functional change in the computer.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler, (5,585,838), view of Roop, (U.S. Pat # 5,790,198).

Considering claims 1, 11-12, the claimed information providing apparatus and method, comprising;

‘hierarchizing means for hierarchizing EPG information to be provided into first information which designates predetermined information on specific broadcast programs, and second information, referred to by the first information as general information on the program’, is met by the disclosure of Lawler, (Fig. 4A-4C; col. 11, lines 10-65). Lawler teaches that the EPG display provides a plurality of channel slots/objects that contain the titles of broadcast programs. Both the channel slots and the focus frame 102 that highlights a selected channel slot reads on the claimed first information. The second information reads on the title of the programs in Lawler. The ‘hierarchizing means’ reads on the headend 12 in Lawler, which generates EPG data, see Fig. 1; col. 6; col. 12, lines 60-67 thru col. 13, lines 1-10.

Lawler does not specifically discuss whether one of the EPG information may or may be changed. However, the additional feature of, ‘wherein the first information, which may change, comprises EPG information associated with a program’, reads on the broadcast start time of a particular broadcast program, see Roop, col. 75, lines 30-67 thru col. 76, lines 1-25; col. 77, lines 15-35; col. 81, lines 10-48& Table LXI. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Lawler with the feature of updating changed broadcast time of programs, providing the subscriber with update schedule information as taught by Roop.

‘wherein the second information, which may not be changed, comprises EPG information associated with a program’, is broad enough to read on any of the parameters of the Show list record that are not changed, and any parameters of the EPG in Lawler that are not changed.

It is noted that the claim uses the phrase “the first information, which may change”... and “the second information, which may not change”. Applicant appears to construe these features as “can” and “cannot change”. However, it is pointed out that whether an item, “may change” means it may or may not change, and likewise whether an item “may not change”, also has the same alternatives. Thus the second information may or may not change in the present claim. The does not recite that the second information “will not change” or “does not change”.

‘first providing means for providing at least one of the first information and second information’, is inherent in Roop which discloses the EPG information packets, that carry EPG data from a broadcaster to a subscriber terminal, see Table LXI.

‘second providing means for providing layout information which relates to a layout of the EPG information when displayed on the screen, wherein the first information and the second information each include a tag to enable the data included therein to be associated with the layout information, is inherent in both Lawler & Roop, since the elements of the EPG records are synchronized fro display as a unit.

The claimed ‘layout information’ reads on the combination of Lawler (col. 7, lines 51-65 & col. 8, lines 21-45) and Roop.

Considering claims 2, 6 & 20, Lawler teaches that EPG may be transmitted to the station controller 18, at least by satellite or CATV which meets the requirement, see col. 7, lines 1-15.

Considering claim 3, Roop teaches that the EPG may be updated, col. 77, lines 20-35.

Considering claims 4-5, Roop teaches the use of the VBI to transmit the EPG data, col. 56, lines 5-15; col. 60, lines 40-64.

Considering claims 7-8, Roop teaches detecting when information within the EPG needs to be updated and only updating that information, which reads on the claimed subject matter, col. 75, lines 30-55; col. 76, lines 10-22.

Considering claims 9-10, the claimed third & fourth information reads on the additional information associated with the programs in Roop, see Table LXI. As for the information identifying a performer, Roop teaches that one of the parameters associated with a TV program may be the actor(s) such as Star 1- Star 3, col. 78, lines 35-45.

Considering claims 13, 15-16 & 21-25, the claimed elements that correspond with subject matter mentioned above in the rejection of claims 1 & 11, are likewise treated. The additionally claimed features of a first and second acquiring means for acquiring information regarding the first and second information and the layout information is met by the operation of the interactive station controller 18, Lawler col. 7, lines 20-25 & col. 8, lines 21-30, which controls storing and retrieving the EPG information from storage. The claimed ‘producing means for producing display information’, is broad enough to read on the operation of the graphics subsystem 62, which includes video processor subsystem 63 and mixer 64, see col. 7, lines 50-60, in Lawler.

Considering claim 14, Lawler provides a display means (Fig. 2).

Considering claims 17-18, the feature of first information means designated as second intermediate information reads on combination of Lawler, such as the program grid 80 and program tile 88, col. 8, lines 45-60 & Fig. 3 and Roop.

Considering claims 19-20, Lawler teaches that the layout information may be received over a wired or satellite connection, and at least temporarily stored in memory in the station controller 18, col. 5, lines 45-60 & col. 7, lines 44-65.

*Conclusion*

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Hendricks Teaches storing an EPG template on an receiver and updating the elements of eth EPG periodically.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**or faxed to:**

(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:**

(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

*Reuben R*  
REUBEN M. BROWN  
PATENT EXAMINER